



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/584,649	06/26/2006	Dirk Randolph	PD040002	8142
24498	7590	01/21/2010	EXAMINER	
Robert D. Shedd, Patent Operations			DASGUPTA, SOUMYA	
THOMSON Licensing LLC				
P.O. Box 5312			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312			2176	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/21/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/584,649	GANDOLPH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SOUMYA DASGUPTA	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 October 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-7 and 12-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-7 and 12-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

Reopening of Prosecution After Appeal Brief or Reply Brief

In view of the Appeal Brief filed on October 22, 2009, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of Rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below.

/Stephen S. Hong/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178

Applicant's Response

In the applicant's response for application 10/584,649 dated October 22, 2009, the applicant did not amend any claims; and argued against all the rejections and objections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 5 and 17:

Claims 5 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the

The phrase "wherein number from among the available menu pages within the defined range, the menu page with the next higher page number relative to the page number of said first menu page is selected if the numeric value indicates a higher page number than the page number of the first menu page" is confusing, poorly worded, and not clearly understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. *In order to clarify the subject matter, the examiner recommends that the applicant amend the claim to positively recite the limitation so that it is clearly understood (emphasis added) by one of ordinary skill in the art.*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-7 and 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Goldsmith et al (US 2005/0076309; PG Pub Date: April 7, 2005; Patent Filing Date: Oct 3, 2003; Assignee: Microsoft; hereafter Goldsmith) in view of Moehrle (US 7,191,411; Patent Issue Date: Mar 13, 2007; Patent Filing Date: Jun 6, 2002; hereafter Moehrle).

Claim 1:

Goldsmith discloses:

A method for automatically generating an electronic menu including a plurality of menu pages, wherein menu pages contain selectable menu items with associated commands to be executed upon activation of the respective menu item, the method comprising: (pre-amble) (Fig 5 → Goldsmith discloses “automatically generating an electronic menu including a plurality of menu pages” in that a list of categories are produced in a menu-like system. Fig 5 → Goldsmith discloses “menu pages contain selectable menu items with associated commands to be executed upon activation of the respective menu item” in that the user can click on the hyperlink from the tree-menu.

wherein associating a <pointer> with each menu page; (limitation 1) (Fig 5, Paragraphs [0010] and [0011] → Goldsmith discloses this limitation in that each menu selection has a pointer associated with it. The forward pointer allows navigation to a

successive menu and the backward pointer allows navigation to a previous menu.

According to Fig 5, the user can navigate between successive and previous menus.

Moreover, the examiner notes that "page numbers" are functionally equivalent to pointers to other menus because the applicant is referring to *Fig 1, item 14 of the application* as the "page number" (Playlist #xxxx). The Playlist numbers refers to the current menu and points successive and previous menus pending on the user's selection.)

a first menu page containing at least one menu item with an associated command and associated data, wherein the command associated with the menu item comprises switching to another menu page; (limitation 2) (Fig 5, Paragraphs [0010] and [0011] → Goldsmith discloses this limitation in that the user can select the items from a menu to either view more submenus or initiate a command for a function.

According to Fig 5, the user can navigate between successive and previous menus.

Moreover, the examiner notes that "numeric page numbers" are functionally equivalent to pointers to other menus because the applicant is referring to *Fig 1, item 14 of the application* as the "numeric page number" (Playlist #xxxx). The Playlist numbers refers to the current menu and points successive and previous menus pending on the user's selection.)

defining a range of <pointers> based upon said data associated with said command; (limitation 3) (Fig 5, Paragraphs [0010] and [0011] → Goldsmith discloses

this limitation in that the menu contains a list of selections of a sub-menu because the page numbers are functionally equivalent to pointers that designate a selection or a new sub-menu. The examiner interprets “range of page number” to be of selection items on the current menu. Since “page numbers” are functionally equivalent to pointers of the listed selections items on the menu, then the listed selection items on the menu are functionally equivalent to a “range of page numbers” or a range of pointers.)

detecting the <pointers> of the available menu pages; (limitation 4) (Fig 5 → Goldsmith discloses “detecting the page numbers of the available menu pages” in that the whenever a new selection is made, the pointer detects and points to the new menu page so that the new menu can be opened. If a pointer was not available, the new menu selected would not be able to open.)

and selecting a second menu page upon activation of said menu item for switching to another menu page, (limitation 5) (Fig 5, Paragraphs [0010] and [0011] → Goldsmith this limitation in that the user can select a menu item that can open another menu page.)

wherein the second menu page has the first or last <pointers> from among the available menu pages within the defined range of menu pages (limitation 6) (Fig 5, Paragraphs [0010] and [0011] → Goldsmith this limitation in that the user can select

a menu item that can open another menu page. The selected menu can have a pointer to the first menu or be a child menu without any offspring.)

and wherein the first and second menu pages are retrieved from different storage media. (limitation 7) (Fig 5, Paragraphs [0010] and [0011] → Goldsmith discloses “the first and second menu pages are retrieved from different storage media” in that the audio player, QuickTime player, and camera tools can be from different storage devices.)

Goldsmith does not appear to explicitly disclose <pointer(s)> as **page number(s)**.

Moehrle discloses <pointer(s)> as **page number(s)**. (Fig 5a and 5c → Moehrle discloses this limitation in that the user can traverse the menu which are signified by alphanumerical objects that function as pointers. This feature is functionally equivalent to the applicant "page number(s).")

Goldsmith and Moehrle are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of traversing menus.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Goldsmith and Moehrle before him or her, to incorporate a hierarchical menus system, as disclosed by Goldsmith, with an active link menu system, as disclosed by Moehrle .

The motivation for doing so would have been to utilize a more efficient menu system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Goldsmith with Moehrle to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim.

Claim 2:

Goldsmith discloses:

Method according to claim 1, wherein defining a range of <pointers> is also based upon the <pointer> of said first menu page. (Fig 5, Paragraphs [0010] and [0011] → Goldsmith discloses “defining a range of page numbers is also based upon the page number of said first menu page” in that the menu contains a list of selections of a sub-menu because the page numbers are functionally equivalent to pointers that designate a selection or a new sub-menu. The examiner interprets “range of page number” to be of selection items on the current menu. Since “page numbers” are functionally equivalent to pointers of the listed selection items on the menu, then the listed selection items on the menu are functionally equivalent to a “range of page numbers” or a range of pointers. The user can select the first menu by selecting “launch app>” (see Fig 5).)

Goldsmith does not appear to explicitly disclose <pointer(s)> as **page number(s)**.

Moehrle discloses <pointer(s)> as **page number(s)**. (Fig 5a and 5c → Moehrle discloses this limitation in that the user can traverse the menu which are signified by alphanumerical objects that function as pointers. This feature is functionally equivalent to the applicant "page number(s).")

Goldsmith and Moehrle are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of traversing menus.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Goldsmith and Moehrle before him or her, to incorporate a hierarchical menus system, as disclosed by Goldsmith, with an active link menu system, as disclosed by Moehrle .

The motivation for doing so would have been to utilize a more efficient menu system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Goldsmith with Moehrle to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim.

Claim 3:

Goldsmith discloses:

Method according to claim 2, wherein said range is further defined by a <pointer> of another menu page that is stored on the same storage medium as the first menu page. (Fig 5 → Goldsmith discloses “range is further defined by a page number of another menu page that is stored on the same storage medium as the first menu

page." in that the whenever a new selection is made the menu of the application can be from the same storage device.)

Goldsmith does not appear to explicitly disclose <pointer(s)> as **page number(s)**.

Moehrle discloses <pointer(s)> as **page number(s)**. (Fig 5a and 5c → Moehrle discloses this limitation in that the user can traverse the menu which are signified by alphanumerical objects that function as pointers. This feature is functionally equivalent to the applicant "page number(s).")

Goldsmith and Moehrle are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of traversing menus.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Goldsmith and Moehrle before him or her, to incorporate a hierarchical menu system, as disclosed by Goldsmith, with an active link menu system, as disclosed by Moehrle .

The motivation for doing so would have been to utilize a more efficient menu system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Goldsmith with Moehrle to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim.

Claim 4:

Goldsmith discloses:

Method according to claim 1, wherein said range is defined by a placeholder within said data associated with said command. (Fig 5 → Goldsmith discloses “range is defined by a placeholder within said data associated with said command” in that the pointer is programmed into memory so that the user can select the appropriate navigation options.)

Claim 5:

Goldsmith discloses:

Method according to claim 1, wherein said data associated with said contain a numeric value and wherein the range of <pointers> is defined by the numeric value and the <pointer> of said first menu page, (Fig 5, Paragraphs [0010] and [0011] → Goldsmith discloses “data associated with said contain a numeric value and wherein the range of page numbers is defined by the numeric value and the page number of said first menu page” in that the pointers can be designated with alphanumeric code.)

and wherein number from among the available menu pages within the defined range, the menu page with the next higher <pointer> relative to the <pointer> of said first menu page is selected if the numeric value indicates a higher <pointer> than the <pointer> of the first menu page. (Fig 5, Paragraphs [0010] and [0011] → Examiner Interpretation: Goldsmith discloses this limitation in that the user can select successive or previous menus. According to Figure 13 of the Application, the "higher

page numbers" are the successive menus of the root menu and the "lower page number" are the root menu.)

Goldsmith does not appear to explicitly disclose <pointer(s)> as **page number(s)**.

Moehrle discloses <pointer(s)> as **page number(s)**. (Fig 5a and 5c → Moehrle discloses this limitation in that the user can traverse the menu which are signified by alphanumerical objects that function as pointers. This feature is functionally equivalent to the applicant "page number(s).")

Goldsmith and Moehrle are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of traversing menus.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Goldsmith and Moehrle before him or her, to incorporate a hierarchical menus system, as disclosed by Goldsmith, with an active link menu system, as disclosed by Moehrle .

The motivation for doing so would have been to utilize a more efficient menu system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Goldsmith with Moehrle to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim.

Claim 6:

Goldsmith discloses:

Method according to claim 1, wherein a menu page is stored in a separate file, or in a selectable portion of a file, and the page number is determined by the name of the file, or by the name of the file and the selectable portion within the file, in which it is stored. (Fig 5 → Goldsmith discloses “menu page is stored in a separate file, or selectable portion of a file, and the page number is determined by the name of the file, or the name of the file and the selectable portion within the file, in which it is stored” in the hardware in the computer stores the menu is a cache memory or permanent storage either within the software itself or in a separate file designating a menu.)

Claim 7:

Goldsmith discloses:

Method according to claim 1, wherein the <pointer> associated with the first or second menu page depends on user specific settings. (Fig 5 and 7 → Goldsmith discloses “the page number associated with the first or second menu page depends on user specific settings” in that the user can select the item on the menu that is specified to the user’s settings. The user’s settings can select features that can be added to the menu. Fig 7, item 504 → “Personal Info Manager” and “System”)

Goldsmith does not appear to explicitly disclose <pointer(s)> as **page number(s)**.

Moehrle discloses <pointer(s)> as **page number(s)**. (Fig 5a and 5c → Moehrle discloses this limitation in that the user can traverse the menu which are signified by alphanumerical objects that function as pointers. This feature is functionally equivalent to the applicant "page number(s).")

Goldsmith and Moehrle are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of traversing menus.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Goldsmith and Moehrle before him or her, to incorporate a hierarchical menus system, as disclosed by Goldsmith, with an active link menu system, as disclosed by Moehrle .

The motivation for doing so would have been to utilize a more efficient menu system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Goldsmith with Moehrle to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim.

Claim 12:

Goldsmith discloses:

Method according to claim 1, wherein detecting of the page numbers of the available menu pages includes detecting if the corresponding AV content selectable from said menu page is also available. (Fig 5; Fig 7, item 504 → Goldsmith discloses " detecting of the page numbers of the available menu pages

includes detecting if the corresponding AV content selectable from said menu page is also available" in that a multimedia feature such as QuickTime or Audio player can be selected.)

Claim 13:

Claim 13 corresponds to Claim 1.

Claim 14:

Claim 14 corresponds to Claim 5.

Claim 15:

Goldsmith discloses:

Optical storage medium for storing audio-visual content and menu data for a multi-page menu, wherein menu pages have <pointers>, and wherein at least a first menu page contains a command for selecting a second menu page, (Figs 5 and 7; Paragraph [0010] and [0011] → Goldsmith discloses this limitation in that the AV data can be selected from the menu and the root menu contains a selection that can navigate to the second page.)

wherein the command for selecting a second menu page specifies a range of two or more menu pages to select, and a predefined rule specifies which menu page of the range of menu pages is selected next; (Figs 5 and 7; Paragraph [0010] and

[0011] → Goldsmith discloses this limitation in that each menu selection has a pointer associated with it. The forward pointer allows navigation to a successive menu and the backward pointer allows navigation to a previous menu. According to Fig 5, the user can navigate between successive and previous menus. Moreover, the examiner notes that "page numbers" are functionally equivalent to pointers to other menus because the applicant is referring to *Fig 1, item 14 of the application* as the "page number" (Playlist #xxxx). The Playlist numbers refers to the current menu and points successive and previous menus pending on the user's selection.)

and for at least one page number within said range no relating menu page is stored on the optical storage medium. (Figs 5 and 7 → Goldsmith discloses "at least one page number within said range no relating menu page is stored on the optical storage medium" in that hardware in the computer stores the menu in a cache memory or permanent storage either within the software itself or in a separate file designating a menu. The examiner notes that the limitations refer to data NOT being stored.)

Goldsmith does not appear to explicitly disclose <pointer(s)> as **page number(s)**.

Moehrle discloses <pointer(s)> as **page number(s)**. (Fig 5a and 5c → Moehrle discloses this limitation in that the user can traverse the menu which are signified by alphanumerical objects that function as pointers. This feature is functionally equivalent to the applicant "page number(s).")

Goldsmith and Moehrle are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of traversing menus.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Goldsmith and Moehrle before him or her, to incorporate a hierarchical menus system, as disclosed by Goldsmith, with an active link menu system, as disclosed by Moehrle .

The motivation for doing so would have been to utilize a more efficient menu system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Goldsmith with Moehrle to obtain the invention as specified in the instant claim.

Claim 16:

Claim 16 corresponds to Claim 4.

Claim 17:

Claim 17 corresponds to Claim 5.

Claim 18:

Claim 18 corresponds to Claim 6.

Claim 19:

Claim 19 corresponds to Claim 7.

Claim 20:

Claim 20 corresponds to Claim 12.

Response to Arguments

Claim (5 and 17) Rejection under 35 USC 112 (2nd Paragraph):

The appellant argues that the limitation “wherein number from among the available menu pages within the defined range, the menu page with the next higher page number relative to the page number of said first menu page is selected if the numeric value indicates a higher page number than the page number of the first menu page” is not confusing and the rejection should be withdrawn. The appellant attempts to further clarify the meaning on the limitation on the Applicant's Arguments (pg 6-8) dated October 22, 2009.

The examiner disagrees.

The examiner has noted the appellant's attempt to clarify the meaning of the limitation, the limitation as currently recited is still confusing and not easily understood by one of ordinary skill in the art; however, the explanation of this confusing limitation is not sufficient and does not obviate a 112(2nd paragraph) rejection. The examiner HIGHLY

RECOMMENDS that the appellant amend the limitation in order to CLARIFY its meaning.

Claim (1-7 and 12-20) Rejection under 35 USC ~ 102(b):

Applicant's arguments filed October 22, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SOUMYA DASGUPTA whose telephone number is (571)272-7432. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 9am-7pm, F 9am-1pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2178

SD